Infant Marriage.

(14)

Police.

File no. 31—97.

SS 17, 20, 46 & 48.

Enclosed

Mr. K. Parsee,

Communicated

Form No. 3.

S No 50

FACING SHEET FOR FILE.

_____ Branch.

File No. of

SUBJECT.

Prosecution of the parties concerned.
in an infant marriage that took
place at Peddur on Devarahelli in the
Chitradurga Taluk between Lakshm
-maramma and Basavaraja of Jan
-bhatta

J 6161

SECTION

FILE No. 31 97

SER'AL No. 17

3941/6-11-97 1897

(1)

From

The Inspector General of Police
in Mysore.

To

The Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore,
General and Revenue Depts.

Dated 5th
Despatched 6th } November 97
Received 8/11/97
General No. 1661
No. 173

Enclosure No. one and a file of records.

Forwards copy of a memo from the Assistant Superintendent of Police Kolar, reporting on the occurrence of an infant marriage at Palkur on 17.2.96 and requests sanction to the prosecution of persons mentioned.

Subd to the Sec'y
The case is clear -
Sanction is however not sought as against the father of the bride, because he has been prosecuted for another act, & the marriage of another daughter of his, celebrated a few days previous to the performance of the marriage forming the subject of this reference - According to the report rec'd in this office he was fined in that case Rs. 5 by the Dist'e Magistrate on 12.2.97, but the informant in the present case states in his Petition dated 8.5.97 that on appeal (perhaps revision) the fine was enhanced to Rs. 25.
The marriage was celebrated nearly 1 year 9 months ago & it does not seem advisable to initiate criminal proceedings now after the lapse of this interval.

Sd/- Bowring
CP

12/11 12-11-97

7702/

It was my wish that the matter came up when the Hon'ble Member for Home was present - The delay cannot be blamed for the delay - The sanction to the prosecution as applied for by the Head of the Police may be accorded - He need not propose to prosecute the father of the bride because he was punished in the other case. This may be approved

12-11-97

J 8/11/97

12/11

Put up this in connection with that for the prosecution in connection with the marriage of the girl's father

Sub-C.

OFFICE OF THE

INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE IN MYSORE.

No. 1661 / 173 Dated Bangalore, 5th November 1897

Enc. one acknowledgement records.

FROM

THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE IN MYSORE.

To

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVT. OF MYSORE,
GENERAL AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.

SIR,

I have the honor to forward herewith copy of a Memo received from the Assistant Superintendent of Police, Kolar District, reporting on the occurrence of an infant marriage at Peddur or Basarlahally in the Chintamani Taluk on the 17th February 1896.

The Police enquiry shows that the parties are Brahmins by

by caste, that a girl named Lakshm Narasammah aged 4 years, 5 months and 29 days and daughter of Venkate -chellapah was given in marriage to Panchangi Sama Bhatta aged 22 years and that the marginally noted persons celebrated the marriag at Peddur or Dasarlahally. The Register of births shows that th girl was born on the 18th August 1891.

Venketachelapa, father of the bride.
Shama Bhatta.
Panchangi Sama Bhatta (bridegroom).
Subbanna.
Devarkonda Sama Bhatta.

3. The Assistant Superintendent of Police recommends that all the persons noted in the margin except the first one, the father of the bride, who had already been convicted in connection with the marriage of his first daughter which took place at the same time as the present one, may be prosecuted

prosecuted for an offence under Section 3 of Regulation No: X of 1894. I beg that sanction may be accorded to the same. The Vernacular records of the case are herewith forwarded for perusal and obliging return.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most Obedient Servant,

Inspector General of Police

C.R

Enc to C/17 --

Memo.

1/a

Inspector Jayakumariah during his Inspection tours, learnt on 19th May 1897 that the marginally noted persons celebrated at Pedduru or Dasarahally the marriage of an infant girl named Lukshmi Narasamah, 2nd daughter of the 1st accused.

1) Venkatachelapa of Dasarlahally Chintamani TK.
2) His uncle Shama Bhatta
3) Panchangi Sama Bhatta (bride-groom) of Kusandra Village, Chintamani TK.
4) His brother Subanna.
5) Devarkonda Sama Bhatta of Chintamani TK.

2. On making enquiries, the information appeared to be true. Patel Venkatarama Reddi, Hajam Chinniga and Narayana Bhatta stated that the girl was married to Panchangi Sama-bhatta on the 17th February 1896, the day after that on which Venkatachellapah performed the marriage of his first daughter.

3. Venkatachellapah was prosecuted in connection with his first daughter's marriage and convicted (Vide this Office No. 304 of 18.2.97)

4. During the trial of that case, Venkatachellapah stated before the Magistrate

Magistrate, that his second daughter the bride in the present case, was born on the 10th or 11th day of the dark fortnight of Ashadha of Khara. He keeps to that statement even now and admits further that this marriage was performed on the day after the other marriage was performed.

The Register of births shows that the girl was born on 18-8-91. The marriage having taken place on 1-2-96 the girl was 4 years, 5 months and 29 days when married.

The marriage was therefore against law.

Second accused Shama Bhatta the uncle of Venkatachelappah admits of his having performed Vandi for this girl, at the request of the 1st accused, and having given her the girl to the 3rd accused, at the

1st

1st accused's attendance.

7. Third accused Panchangi Shama Bhatta, the bride-groom admits having married the girl.

8. The bride groom's brother Subba-nah (4th accused) says he performed the Vaudi for his brother, and was present till the termination of the ceremony.

9. The fifth accused Devarkonda Shama Bhat of Chintamani Taluk was the Purohit that officiated in the ceremonies.

10. Venkatachellapah had thus performed the marriage of two of his daughters at one and the same time. As he has already been punished for one of them, it is not advisable to prosecute him again, especially seeing that it was done at the same time, that

he has already known the effects of performing such marriages and that he has been telling the truth.

11. I would therefore request sanction for prosecuting all, but Venkelachellapah for the reasons given above.

12. The information having reached the Police on 19th May 1897, and the investigation having extended to the end of September, this Memo could not be submitted earlier. Sanction for prosecution has thus to be asked one year and eight months after the marriage.

(Signed) G. Krishna Rao
Assistant Superintendent of Police
Kadur District

Copy"

Inspector General of Police

Sir-draft
Sanction
dt 15/11

SECTION Police

FILE No. 31-97

PROCEEDINGS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE.

SERIAL No. 20

READ—

Letter No. 1661-173 dated 5th November 1897
from the Inspector General of Police in Mysore,
reporting that on the 17th Feby 1896 an infant girl of 4 years, 5 months & 29 days old
named Lakshminarsamma, daughter of Venkata-
-challappa
was married to one Panchangi Shama Bhatta aged 22
years
at Peddur or Dasarlahalli, Chintamani Taluk, Kolar Dist.

ORDER THEREON No. 8536-7 / 8648 DATED 18th Nov 1897

Sue: 1 file

Under the provisions of section 8 of Regulation X of 1894, the Government are pleased to direct the prosecution, for offences under section 3 of the Mysore Infant Marriages Prevention Regulation, of the marginally noted persons who caused the marriage of the infant girl named Lakshminarsamma with a man named Panchangi Shama Bhatta and of all persons who knowingly aided and abetted the same, and of the said husband Panchangi Shama Bhatta ~~with the observation that the Government approve of his proposal not to prosecute Venkatachellappa father of the bride, who has already been convicted in connection with another infant marriage which took place about the same time~~ General Secretary.

Sham Bhatta
uncle of Venkata-
-challappa
Subbamma,
mother of bride-
groom
Devarkonda
rama Bhatta,
purohit

Jnd. to S. 14.11.97

To

The Deputy Commissioner, Kolar District.
The Inspector General of Police in Mysore (orig the vernacular recds) with the observation
that the Govt approve of his proposal not to prosecute
Venkatachalappa father of the bride, who has already been
convicted in connection with another infant marriage which took
place about the same time 18.11.97

J 1144 10

3 1898. 7570
2-3-98.

From

The Inspector General of Police
in Mysore.

ECTION Police

LE No. 31-97

RIAL No. 46

To

The Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore,
General and Revenue Depts.

Dated 28th ~~February~~ March 1898.

Despatched 1st March 1898.

Received 2 " "

General No. 3096

No. 360

Enclosure No.

Reporting the conviction and sentence passed on the parties concerned in an Infant marriage that took place at Dasarlahalli in the Chintamani Taluk.

2/3/98
Refer Bishop.
B/B
3/3/98

OFFICE OF THE

INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE IN MYSORE.

No. 3096/360 Dated....28th February...1898.

Enc.

FROM

THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE IN MYSORE.

To

THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVT. OF MYSORE,
GENERAL AND REVENUE DEPARTMEN

SIR,

With reference to Govern-
ment Proceedings No. 5736-7/J.648 dated 18th
November 1897 sanctioning the prosecution
of the parties Concerned in an infant mar-
riage that took place at Dasarlahalli in
the Chintamani Taluk, I have the honor
to state that the Case was tried by the
District Magistrate, Kolar, on the 10th

instant and that the marginally noted three persons were sentenced to pay fines as noted against their names. Subbanna, brother of the bridegroom, is reported to have been acquitted on the ground that he was a divided brother and had no concern with the marriage, and that he only assisted in performing Kandi ceremony in the absence of any other relative.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

K Chandy
Inspector General
of Police.

1. Vemuri Venkanna, uncle of Purnachandra Rao, the father of the bride, - to a fine of Rs 5/-, in default to one week's simple imprisonment.
2. Pavelangi Skanna Bhatta, the bridegroom - to a fine of Rs 10/-, in default to one week's simple imprisonment.
3. Devarkonda Skanna Bhatta, the Purohit - to a fine of Rs 3/-, in default to one week's simple imprisonment.

SECTION Police

FILE No. 31--97

SERIAL No. 48.

Read,

Letter No. 3096/360 dated 28th February 1898 from the Inspector General of Police in Mysore, stating with reference to Govt Proceedings No. 5736/3648 dated 18th November 1897, sanctioning the prosecution parties concerned in an infant marriage that took place at Basavalahalli in the Chintamani Taluk, that the marginally noted 3 persons were sentenced to pay a fine of Rs/ 5, 10 & 3. respectively and ~~that~~ in default to suffer each, one week's simple imprisonment.

x 1. Thammanna, the father of the bride.
2. S. Ramakrishnaiya, the bridegroom
3. (Deceased) Ramakka, Mother of the bridegroom.

order thereon No 11206 / 1220 dt 11-3-98

Recorded.

8/3/98
for Secy:

To,
The I. Gl of
Police in Mysore.

Mr A. Saulis.
Is this ltr. right?
Mrd
28.3/98
Shew
Mrd
1/4/98